REMARKS

Claims 7, 8, 10 and 13-23 remain in the application. Although the Examiner previously identified allowable subject matter, the most recent office action presents rejections based on newly cited art: Baker (U.S. 5,555,151), Latu (U.S. 6,757,386) and Awata (U.S. 6,263,015). Independent claims 7, 15 and 22, as well as dependent claims 8, 10, 13 and 21 were rejected as anticipated by Baker, while claims 14 and 23 were rejected as obvious in view of Baker. Further, claims 16 and 18 were rejected based on a combination of Baker and Latu while claims 16, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected over Baker in view of Awata.

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's efforts to identify potentially relevant art and has, in response thereto, amended the claims to more clearly present combinations which are patentably distinct over the art of record. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The Baker reference had been applied against the claims because it was found to relate to a power supply circuit. However, the Baker reference appears to address an entirely different problem from that subject matter to which the claims are expressly directed. As noted at col. 3, lines 13-22, cited by the Examiner, in the context of no-break power transfer, the Baker reference deals with situations in which "any phase of a target source of electric power differs from the associated phase of the present source in magnitude, phase relationship, or frequency ..." Applicant is not at all concerned with such disparity or removal of such disparity. It is only in that context that the Baker reference discloses generation of "a synchronization error signal in response to any ... differing in magnitude, phase relationship, or frequency ..."

In contrast, the invention as now presented in claim 7 is directed to a communication system of the type including a plurality of communications circuit modules, e.g., in a computer, with "at least one of the modules being compliant with a maximum permissible voltage level" such as required by the SELV standard. The invention provides a regulating circuit "to control output of at least a first of the power supply components with respect to the maximum permissible voltage level during operation of the communication system." The regulating circuit is configured "to control voltage output from the first power supply component so that deviation exceeding the maximum permissible voltage level is reduced or prevented."

It is submitted that the above-quoted language defines patentably distinct subject matter. None of the prior art addresses such control over a maximum voltage level in a plurality of communications circuit modules.

For similar reasons the subject matter of independent claims 15 and 22 is also allowable. For example, claim 15 requires a plurality of communications circuit modules each operable at one or more of a plurality of voltages. At least one of the modules is "compliant with a maximum permissible voltage differential according to the Safety Extra Low Voltage (SELV) standard as defined in the IEC 60950 standard of the International Electrotechnical Commission ..." A power supply circuit ... [includes] a regulating circuit for regulating voltage output from a first of the power supply components relative to the SELV standard ..." Specifically, "the regulating circuit is connected between outputs of power supply components between which the maximum voltage differential occurs during normal operation of the system ..."

The method of operating a power supply circuit in a communication system (claim 22) requires a plurality of power supply components for simultaneously supplying modules of the communication system with multiple voltage levels. A regulating circuit is connected to outputs of at least the first power supply component and one of the other power supply components between which a maximum voltage differential occurs during normal operation of the communication system. The regulating circuit is adapted to reduce or eliminate deviation of the maximum voltage differential beyond a reference voltage value, The method compares the maximum voltage differential with the reference voltage value and adjusts voltage output from one of the power supply components when the maximum voltage differential exceeds the reference voltage value.

The above-described features do not at all relate to no-break power transfers between different sources of electric power but, rather, relate to controlling voltage levels during simultaneous provision of multiple voltage levels in a communication system. Each of the dependent claims further defines a patentable combination which further distinguishes over the prior art. For these reasons it is submitted that none of the secondary references compensate for the deficiencies of the Baker reference with respect to the now-claimed subject matter.

Conclusion

The claims and specification have been amended to place the application in condition for allowance and the examiner is requested to pass this application to issuance. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/29/07

By: _____

John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830